



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/407,916 03/21/95 HARARI

E HARI-0611

EXAMINER

POPER, J

25M1/1005

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

GERALD P PARSONS
MAJESTIC PARSONS SIEBERT & HSUE
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER
SUITE 1450
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111-4121

2511

DATE MAILED: 10/05/95

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), _____ days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152. |
| 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1, and 4 to 9 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.

3. ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.

4. ☒ Claims 1, and 4 to 9 are rejected.

5. ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.

6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).

10. ☒ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on 03/21/95, has (have) been ☒ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).

12. ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.

13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Claims 6 to 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1 to 4 of prior U.S. Patent No. 5,418,752. This is a double patenting rejection.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Ali et al. or Sparks et al in view of Rao.

Ali and Sparks discloses all the subject matter claimed except for means for selecting a plurality of sectors among the one or more chips for erase operation. Rao clearly teaches that an array of Flash EEPROM can have a sector of the array erased without erasing the other sectors of the array for the purpose of reducing programming time. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to program the CPU 30 of Sparks or the microprocessor 52 of

Serial Number: 407,916
Art Unit: 2511

-3-

Ali to select a plurality of sectors among the EEPROMS in order to reduce program timing of the memory.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Joseph Popek at telephone number (703) 308-0956.

J Popek Popek/tj

Oct. 3, 1995

J Popek
JOSEPH A. POPEK
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 2500